

## **II. Remarks**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is independent. Each of Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 has each been amended herein to recite “reinforcing frame segments” in place of “reinforcing frames”. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 1-4 and paragraphs [0051] and [0058]-[0065] of the instant application. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,992,734 B1 to Morishita, et al. (“Morishita”). This rejection is traversed.

As amended, independent Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device. The liquid crystal display device includes a U-shaped main body case having opposing side walls and other open portions and a relatively wide bottom wall, a backlight unit housed in the main body, and an optical member placed on the surfaces of both side walls of the main body case while covering the backlight unit. The optical member is placed on the surfaces of both side walls of the main body case where the backlight unit is housed. The outer periphery of the optical member is encased by reinforcing frame segments that are joined at corners to form a picture frame.

In particular, the use of reinforcing frame segments that are joined at corners to form a picture frame, and the encasement of the outer periphery of the optical member by the reinforcing frame segments, provides the present invention with

several advantages over conventional liquid crystal display devices, which typically use frames of unitary construction. First, the use of reinforcing frame segments reduces the incidence of twist or distortion by vibration of the frame. This enables the optical member to be firmly affixed to the main body case. Second, this configuration enables easy disassembly of the device without dismantling of the backlight unit or the optical member. Third, as compared with a frame of unitary construction, measurement accuracy of each member is increased. This enables the overall manufacturing cost to be reduced.

In contrast, Morishita fails to disclose the use of reinforcing frame segments that are joined at corners to form a picture frame. As indicated at page 2 of the Office Action, Morishita discloses frames (1) and (2) which are joined at corners by screw holes (23), as shown in Figure 1 and disclosed in the specification at column 4, lines 44-52. However, an inspection of Figure 1 clearly illustrates that each of frames (1) and (2) is a frame of unitary construction, and thus, the joining of the frames in Morishita constitutes the joining of two complete, integral frames to one another. Accordingly, there is no description or teaching of joining frame segments together in order to form the frame, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Therefore, because Morishita fails to disclose that the outer periphery of the optical member is encased by reinforcing frame segments that are joined at corners to form a picture frame as recited in independent Claim 1, Applicants submit that independent Claim 1 is allowable over Morishita. In addition, each of Claims 2-6 depends from independent Claim 1, and each of these dependent claims is allowable

for the same reasons as those discussed above.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants' attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Attorney for Applicants  
James A. Gromada  
Registration No. 44,727

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN, L.L.P.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
East Lobby, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20007-2501  
Facsimile: (202) 298-7570  
Customer No.: 27160